

**Moab Remedial Action Contract (RAC)**  
**Request for Task Order Proposal**  
**Questions and Responses 31-91**  
**January 19, 2011**

31. Section L.7 (B) Criterion 2 – Key Personnel and Organization (Last Paragraph) “The contractor shall describe the proposed organizational structure, including roles.....” Question – is this description part of the 40 page limit for Volume II Technical and Management Proposal?

Response: Yes, the organizational structure is part of the 40 page limit for Technical and Management Proposal.

32. Is the Critical Path Schedule for Criteria 1 is part of the 40 page count? Can a fold-out larger than 11 x 17 be used for the schedule and counted as one page?

Response: RTP Section L.5, Table L-2, will be modified to add a maximum 20 page limit for the schedule, in addition to the 40 page limit. Additionally, Table L-1 will be modified to state that schedule paper size shall not exceed 11” x 17” and will be counted as 1 page.

33. Section L.8 (k) (2) states that “For proposal preparation purposes, the contractors shall assume no facilities or equipment are available at the time of contract transition.” If it is necessary that equipment is to be procured by the contractor in support of the work defined in the PWS, would it be possible for that equipment to be staged on site during the transition period?

Response: The GFP will be available at the time the contractor assumes full responsibility. Any equipment procured by the contractor in support of the work during the transition period will be allowed to be staged on-site.

34. Section L.8(q) states that the contractor shall not propose any GFP for use in performance of the contract other than that provided in Section J. However L-7, assumption 7 has the contractor assume a \$4M equipment list will be purchased by the contractor at the beginning of the task order. This seems at odds with the L.8(q) requirement. Please clarify.

Response: The equipment listed in Attachment L-7, Item 7, is not owned by the DOE and is not considered GFP. The assumption recognizes that the contractors will likely purchase some equipment from the incumbent contractor at its residual value to accomplish the scope, thereby eliminating the need to decontaminate and remove (incumbent activity) and replace the equipment (new contractor activity).

35. PWS element C.2.6.1 states that the contractor’s responsibility includes “design, excavation and construction of the disposal cell.” Attachment L-7 Cost Assumptions/Information states that the Phase I cell will be complete, Phase 2 excavation complete and placement of RRM ongoing, and costs are to be assumed for Phase III. Please clarify if there will be any design and excavation required for the disposal cell as stated in the PWS.

Response: Refer to answers # 5 from Q&A’s dated 1-13-11.

36. Section C.2 of the Performance Work Statement (PWS) states that “the contractor shall furnish all personnel, facilities, equipment, material, services and supplies (except for Government Furnished Services/Items identified in Attachment J-C and Services provided by the Technical Assistance Contractor as identified in Attachment J-E)”. The list of facilities identified in Attachment J-C does not include the following facilities: an office trailer located in the queue area; the guard stations at both the Moab and Crescent Junction sites; a decontamination trailer near the guard station at the Moab site; and the lidding/de-lidding building. It is our understanding from the pre-proposal site tour that these facilities are the responsibility of the Remedial Action Contractor (RAC). Please clarify as to whether these facilities will be provided to the RAC as Government Furnished Services/Items (GFSI).

Response: Attachment J-C will be revised to include the facilities referenced in the question. The GFP list is DOE owned property that can be used by the RAC to perform the work. Facilities required to perform work as stated in the PWS will be provided to the contractor as GFP.

37. The facilities identified in Attachment J-C include various equipment and materials. For example: the office trailers include desks, chairs, etc.; the maintenance facility includes spare parts and tools; the conference/break

rooms include tables, chairs, refrigerators, audio/visual equipment, etc.; the access control trailer at the Moab site includes washers, dryers, furniture, shelving; etc. It is our understanding from the pre-proposal site tour that the equipment and materials in many of these facilities are a part of the facility, and it would therefore appear that these materials and equipment would be provided to the RAC as GFSI. Please clarify.

Response: Office furniture (desk, tables, chairs, etc.) are considered part of the facility and will be provided as GFP. However, Attachment J-C will not be modified to include these specific individual items (e.g., chairs, tables, etc.). During transition, the RAC will perform a complete inventory in accordance with PWS Section C.2.1.

In the Moab access trailer the furniture, washers, and dryers will also be provided as GFP.

The Maintenance Facility spare parts at the Moab and Crescent Junction facility are GFP. Miscellaneous hand tools are not provided to the contractors as GFP.

AV equipment is provided to the RAC by the TAC and is considered GFP.

38. There are several Con Ex boxes located at the Moab site. During the pre-proposal site tour, it was stated that at least one of these Con Ex boxes was used for storing personal protective equipment (PPE). Please clarify if this and or any other Con Ex boxes are to be provided to the RAC as GFSI and what equipment and material within the Con Ex box (that is not currently identified on the list in Attachment J-C) will be provided to the RAC, as well, as GFSI.

Response: 5 Con Ex boxes at the Moab Site and 3 Con Ex box at the Crescent Junction site are used to store PPE inside the contamination area. These will be provided as GFP.

39. There are several fuel tanks at the Moab and Crescent Junction sites, as well propane tanks at both sites, potable watertanks at Moab, a magnesium chloride storage tank at Moab, and non-potable water storage tanks at Moab. None of these tanks are identified in Attachment J-C. Please clarify as to whether these tanks will be provided to the RAC as GFSI, or who owns these tanks.

Response: Attachment J-C will be modified to include the propane tanks, portable water systems, and the Magnesium Chloride storage tank as GFP.

40. Although radiological controls instruments (e.g., friskers) are currently being utilized in support of the Moab field activities, many of these instruments were not included in the GFSI list in Attachment J-C. Please clarify as to whether there are radiological controls instruments that will be provided to the RAC as GFSI.

Response: Attachment J-C will be revised to include these items. All radiological control equipment used on the project will be provided as GFP.

41. During the pre-proposal site tour, it was stated that there is a soils testing laboratory in the Atlas Building that will be used by the RAC. No equipment associated with this soils testing laboratory could be found in the GFSI list in Attachment J-C. Please clarify as to what equipment is included within the soils testing laboratory and whether this equipment will be provided to the RAC as GFSI.

Response: Attachment J-C will be revised to include all equipment in the soils testing lab.

42. Section C.2.1 of the PWS states that the contractor shall submit a Performance Management Baseline (PMB) in accordance with DOE Order 413.3B, as a part of the transition activities. Attachment J-A, however, states that the PMB is to be submitted within 120 days of task order award. Please clarify when the PMB is to be submitted to DOE for review and approval.

Response: The contractor shall submit the PMB within 120 days of task order award in accordance with Attachment J-A, Task Order Deliverables/Submittals. Section C.2.1 of the PWS will be modified.

43. Section C.2.1 of the PWS discusses the submittal of documents for DOE review and approval. In addition, Attachment J-A identifies specific deliverables and the required due dates. What should be assumed relative to

DOE review times for documents submitted to DOE for approval? Will anyone be reviewing these documents other than DOE?

Response: The contractor can anticipate a typical DOE review time of 10 working days for documents. The Technical Assistance Contractor (TAC) is often involved in review of RAC documents. Documents requiring regulatory review and/or approvals (i.e., Remedial Action Plan) will be transmitted to the appropriate regulatory agency.

44. Within the PWS and during the pre-proposal tour, it was stated that the RAC has certain responsibilities in support of activities performed by others such as DOE and the TAC. For example, for facilities that are shared by these organizations (e.g., access control trailer, conference/break room, office trailers, etc.), the RAC is to provide maintenance of these facilities. Is the RAC to also provide PPE for these various other parties? Is there any other physical support that the RAC is to be providing for the TAC, DOE, etc.?

Response: In accordance with PWS Section C.2.7.5, the RAC shall provide Radcon support which includes providing PPE for work in a radiological area (e.g., coveralls, Tyvek, nitrile and cotton gloves, booties and TLDs). DOE and the TAC have their own general construction PPE (e.g., hard hats, safety glasses, safety vests, etc.). The RAC also provides bottled water for the TAC and DOE staff at both the Moab and Crescent Junction sites. No other physical support is being provided by the RAC to the TAC. Attachment J-E will be modified to describe these activities.

45. Attachment L-7 states that the RAC should assume a cost of \$250,000 per fiscal year for the facility and ground maintenance associated with Section C.2.2 of the PWS. Section C.2.2 is written broadly in terms of facility/ground to be maintained, but certain other maintenance activities are addressed elsewhere. Where are the costs for these specific maintenance activities to be covered? The specific items in question are:
- The maintenance of the evaporation pond and clean water construction ponds, which are addressed in Section C.2.3.3 of the PWS, and also seems to be covered in Section C.2.2.
  - The maintenance and repair of rail lines, which is addressed in Section C.2.5, and also seems to be covered in Section C.2.2.
  - Maintenance associated with facilities covered by the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan, which seems to be addressed in Section C.2.7.1, but also appears to be covered in Section C.2.2. Janitorial services is also discussed in Section C.2.7.3, but could also be considered part of facility and ground maintenance.

Response: The cost for maintenance of the evaporation pond and clean water construction ponds should be included WBS C.2.3.3. Section C.2.2 of the PWS will be modified and the maintenance of these two ponds is not included as part of the DOE provided cost.

The cost for maintenance and repair of rail lines should be included in WBS C.2.5. Additionally, Attachment L-7, Item 5, will be modified to include maintenance of rail cost assumptions.

The cost for maintenance associated with facilities covered by the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan and is contained within the DOE provided costs in C.2.2.

The cost for janitorial services shall be included in WBS C.2.7.3., as it is not contained within the DOE provided costs in C.2.2.

46. Section C.2.2 of the PWS states that the remediation contractor is to evaluate and implement utility optimization plans, including re-routing of utilities. Please provide drawings showing the location of the various utility lines, as well as specifics on the utilities, so that we have the information needed to evaluate what needs to be done to perform these activities.

Response: If the contractor is required to perform D&D of man-made structures during the course of the task order, then a Utility Optimization Plan will be required for submittal. In accordance with Attachment L-7, for proposal preparation purposes, the contractor shall assume no cost during this task order period. Section C.2.2 of the PWS will be modified to clarify this requirement.

47. Section C.2.3.1 of the PWS states that “in accordance with approved procedures (emphasis added), the contractor shall monitor, track, and document data on RRM excavated, shipped and disposed.” We could not find a copy of such procedures in the Moab-RAC reference document list. Please identify which procedures that this is referring to or provide a copy of these approved procedures, so that we can evaluate the impact of these requirements.

Response: An approved procedure for monitoring, tracking, and documenting RRM has been posted on the Moab acquisition website.

48. Section C.2.3.2 of the PWS states that the RAC is to “ensure there is no more carry back than 1% by volume”, and requires the RAC to measure and record the amount of carry back to ensure that this requirement is being met. Is carry back currently being measured and recorded? If so, can information on carry back levels be provided so that we can effectively evaluate the extent of any problem in this area?

Response: The current practice of using disposable (single-use) plastic liners in all containers has eliminated carry back volume issues.

49. Section C.2.3.3 of the PWS states that the evaporation pond “collects contaminated groundwater from ground water wells operated by the TAC”. What is the volume of groundwater that the TAC is expected to put into this pond on an average basis and on a maximum basis? This information is needed in order to effectively assess what is needed to perform this work scope.

Response: The RAC and TAC should coordinate work activities to ensure both groundwater and excavation operations are supported. The TAC can meter the groundwater wells to fill the evaporation pond based on the volume available.

50. Section C.2.5 of the PWS references activities associated with the maintenance/repair of the rail line “in accordance with the existing Union Pacific agreement.” What specific agreement is this covered by? For example, are these repairs limited to the sidings at the Moab and Crescent Junction sites? Specifically, is the maintenance and repairs on the main line the responsibility of the railroads? Is there a specific inspection frequency required, and what are the guidelines for determining the necessity of any repairs? It is our understanding that Union Pacific and Utah DOT determined that certain rail crossing upgrades were needed as a result of the rail transportation efforts being performed under this project. Have all of these upgrades been performed? If not, what specific upgrades are needed, is this a part of this maintenance/repair activity, and is there a schedule for performing this work?

Response: Attachment L-7, Item 5b, will be revised to include \$50,000 per fiscal year for rail maintenance. All rail upgrades have been completed. Main line maintenance and repairs are performed by Union Pacific and are not the responsibility of the RAC. Attachment J-E will be modified to describe these activities.

51. Section C.2.6.1 of the PWS states that “the contractor shall minimize the stockpiling of the RRM at Crescent Junction.” Is the term “minimize” defined in an existing project document? Please clarify, so that we can use this information to effectively assess what is required to perform this scope of work.

Response: The FPD will work with the contractor to decide what constitutes “minimal stockpiling” related to various conditions when applicable. The RAP requires the RRM to be placed and compacted in the cell to create a stable mass. The RAP states that the RRM should be shipped from Moab at or near optimum moisture for compaction and excessive stockpiling of RRM can affect optimum moisture. RRM should be placed and compacted as quickly as possible at Crescent Junction to avoid changes in RRM moisture content.

52. Section C.2.7.1 of the PWS states that “the contractor shall perform activities required for environmental monitoring and reporting for the Moab Project Site.” It would appear that the TAC is also responsible for environmental monitoring (e.g., groundwater, surface water, and biota monitoring). How are the environmental monitoring responsibilities distributed between the TAC and the remediation contractor? Does the specified environmental reporting responsibilities include development by the RAC of the Annual Site Environmental Reports? Does any of this reporting include data gathered by the TAC or others? If so, what are the requirements for these organizations providing such data for the development of these reports?

Response: The RAC performs environmental air monitoring; the TAC performs ground water, surface water and biota monitoring and prepares the reports for its monitoring activities. The reporting responsibility for the RAC includes preparing the Annual Site Environmental Report (ASER), which includes data gathered by the TAC that is available in reports prepared by the TAC. Attachment J-A will be revised to add the ASER deliverable. Attachment J-E will be modified to describe these activities.

53. Section C.2.7.1 of the PWS states that "the contractor shall perform activities required for environmental monitoring and reporting for the Moab Project Site." Does this include the 31 air monitors located at the Moab site, Crescent Junction, and at off-site locations, as well as the two meteorological stations at Moab and two meteorological stations at Crescent Junction? Does this include ensuring the operation and maintenance of these monitors? If so, are these to be provided to the RAC as GFSI? A review of Attachment J-A seems to reflect only two air monitoring stations and two meteorological stations being provided to the RAC as GFSI. Please clarify.

Response: Operation and maintenance of the air monitors and meteorological stations is the responsibility of the RAC Contractor. Attachment J-C and J-E will be revised to include the air monitors.

54. Section 2.7.5 of the PWS states that the contractor shall ensure effective on-the-job training. Attachment J-E (Interface Requirements Matrix) states that the TAC is responsible for all project-related training. How is this training interface between the TAC and the RAC defined? For example, are TAC training classes scheduled based on the needs of the RAC, or does the TAC provide a training schedule that the RAC must adhere to?

Response: The training interface is described in the project Training Manual. The TAC generally schedules training classes based on the needs of the RAC. RAC administrative staff coordinates with the TAC to ensure that RAC personnel stay current on their training. A training database is available to all staff and shows individual training needs and expiration dates.

55. The cover sheet to Attachment J-A makes reference to a Table F-1. No such table could be found in the RTP. Please clarify.

Response: Table F-1 does not appear in the RTP, therefore, the cover sheet of Attachment J-A will be modified to delete the reference.

56. Attachment J-A includes the development and submittal of a "Facility/Ground Maintenance Plan" for DOE review and approval. Does such a document currently exist? We could not find a copy of such a document in the Moab-RAC reference document list. Please provide a copy of this document if it exists.

Response: A Facility/Ground Maintenance Plan does not currently exist. It is the contractor's responsibility to develop a Facility/Ground Maintenance Plan in accordance with PWS Section C.2.2 and Attachment J-A. The cost for development of the Facility/Ground Maintenance Plan is included in the DOE provided cost under PWS Section C.2.2.

57. Attachment J-C identifies two locomotives being provided to the RAC as GFSI, and lists the location of these as being in Potash, UT. Please clarify where and how these locomotives are being stored, and what the RAC's responsibilities are with respect to this storage.

Response: The locomotives are being stored on rail track at the Intrepid Potash mining facility, located off of Highway 279, 17 miles from the junction with Highway 191. They are enclosed by a six foot chain link fence with radiological postings.

The locomotives are not currently being used and are winterized. No maintenance is anticipated during the course of this task order, however, in the event maintenance is required, the RAC shall perform the maintenance activities on the locomotives.

58. Attachment J-C identifies a Washington Litruck gantry crane as being provided as GFSI. In addition, Attachment L-7 also includes a gantry crane to be purchased through this contract for use by the project. During the pre-proposal tour, the gantry cranes at the rail siding appeared to be Taylor gantry cranes. Are the two gantry cranes identified above the same two gantry cranes at the Moab rail siding? If not, please clarify.

Response: Yes, the Taylor gantry cranes and Washington Lift truck gantry cranes are the same. Attachment J-C will be revised.

59. The Integrated Execution Plan states that the TAC will provide Nextel phones for the Moab site. Is this only for the Moab site, or for both the Moab and Crescent Junction sites? No such Nextel phones were included on the GFSI list in Attachment J-C. Please provide the number of phones and specifics about the phones.

Response: Attachment J-C will be modified to include Nextel/Sprint phones as GFP available at both Moab and Crescent Junction. The TAC will provide any necessary telephone equipment required by the RAC and approved by DOE.

60. Attachment J-E (Interface Requirements Matrix) states that the TAC is responsible for providing and maintaining all radio communication systems. No radios, however, were included in Attachment J-C (GFSI). Please clarify.

Response: Attachment J-C will be modified to include radios as GFP available at both Moab and Crescent Junction. The TAC will provide any necessary radio equipment required by the RAC and approved by DOE.

61. Attachment J-E (Interface Requirements Matrix) states that the RAC is responsible, in the development of project documents, for adhering to requirements outlined in the Project's Document Production Manual and Document Style Guide. We could not find a copy of such a document in the Moab-RAC reference document list. Please provide a copy of this document, so that we can evaluate the impact of these requirements

Response: The Document Production Manual and Style Guide is posted on the Moab acquisition website.

62. Attachment J-E (Interface Requirements Matrix) states that RAC Management is to be in the Grand Junction Office. Who is this specifically referring to? Is this property to be provided by DOE or the contractor? No Grand Junction office space was included in the real property list in Attachment J-C. Please clarify.

Response: The RAC must maintain an office within the Bank of Colorado building in Grand Junction for at least 4 people. DOE provides the personal property for this space.

63. Attachment J-E (Interface Requirements Matrix) indicates that the TAC is responsible for providing all computer hardware and software. Does this mean that the computers provided to the RAC will be fully functional? What operating system will be installed in the computers, and what software will be loaded onto the computers? If the RAC needs additional computers or software, is there a process in place to ensure that this is provided by the TAC?

Response: Yes, the computers are fully functional and include Windows XP Professional, Version 2002, Service Pack 3. The RAC may request additional computers or software from the TAC which requires approval from DOE. If the contractor requires specialty software as a result of their business operations and/or technical approach, the contractors shall include it in their proposed costs.

64. Section L.8 (e) states that the WBS description shall be at the same level as the WBS in the PWS except for C.2.3, Excavation and Handling at Moab; C.2.5, Transportation; C.2.6, Crescent Junction Operations; and C.2.7, Project Support; which shall be at one level lower than the PWS. This discussion is confusing. Does this mean, for example, that since the PWS shows C.2.3 at one level below (or as C.2.3.1, C.2.3.2, and C.2.3.3), that the WBS is to be even one level below that? For example, would C.2.3.1 need to be taken down one level to C.2.3.1.1, C.2.3.1.2, etc.?

Response: Refer to #7 of the Q&A dated 1/13/11.

65. Do the waste containers identified in L-7 (Cost Assumptions/Information) include the lids?

Response: Yes

66. Attachment L-7 identifies four Komatsu HM 400-2 articulating trucks that the contractor is to purchase. First of all, it would appear that because the costs of these trucks are assigned to CLIN 003 that they are trucks being utilized at Crescent Junction. Please clarify if this is the case or not. Are these trucks the ones being in the cell

area to haul material from the dump to areas for placement, or are they the ones being used to haul the containers from the rail siding to the RRM dump area? Please clarify.

Response: Yes, the trucks are utilized at Crescent Junction within the disposal cell to haul RRM from the dump area for placement.

Attachment L-7, Item 7, will be modified to purchase/lease all equipment under CLIN 0002.

67. During the pre-proposal tour, it was stated that plastic liners are installed in all waste containers (used for transport of the RRM from the Moab site to Crescent Junction) during the winter months. Is this a requirement? What is meant by "winter months" (i.e., is it defined by a specific calendar duration, by temperature, etc.)? What are the design specifications for this liner?

Response: For proposal preparation purpose, the contractors shall assume that all containers require the use of plastic liners at all times. Additionally, liners are 2.5 millimeter poly sheeting.

68. During the pre-proposal tour, it was stated that pore water coming out of the tailings material can have a pH as low as 2.5. What impact have pH levels such as this had on the equipment working directly with the RRM? Please clarify so that we may effectively evaluate this impact.

Response: Historically, the pH levels of pore water have not had a significant impact to equipment, however, the pH levels needs to be continuously monitored.

69. It is our understanding that PPE can be disposed of in the disposal cell at Crescent Junction. Are there any constraints as to how and when this PPE is managed within the overall waste stream for disposal at Crescent Junction? If so, what are they?

Response: Discarded PPE is considered RRM. There are no constraints on disposal of PPE at the Crescent Junction disposal site. Current practice is to collect it in plastic bags filled with PPE and place it with the RRM.

70. According to the CY09 Site Environmental Report, State of Utah regulations require that fugitive dust emissions from construction activities shall not exceed 20 percent opacity. Who is responsible for performing the testing necessary to verify that these opacity limits are being maintained? Who provides the requisite training for those performing this testing?

Response: The RAC determines opacity for RAC-related activities that generates fugitive dust. The RAC provides opacity training for RAC personnel.

71. Section 3.1 of the Excavation Plan states that during the winter/spring of 2011, the existing evaporation pond at the Moab site may be taken out of service so that the area can be used for a drying pad. Is this still the plan? What is the impact of this change?

Response: No, DOE's intent is the evaporation pond will remain functional as long as possible and could extend beyond 2016.

72. Section L.8 (k) states that the contractor shall assume full responsibility at the end of the contract transition period (not greater than 60 calendar days after award). Will the existing RAC be on site and fully operational to up to this point? If so, please provide details as to how DOE expects that the existing RAC will transition out, while the incoming RAC is assuming full operations. For example, how will logistics be managed relative to the removal (including decontamination and radiological surveys) of equipment, turnover of records, transitioning out of personnel, etc. If this is not the case, please explain DOE's plans for transitioning out the existing RAC.

Response: PWS Section C.2.1. requires the submittal of an integrated Transition Plan. The logistics for operations and turnover should be addressed by the incoming contractor in its plan. The existing task order with the current contractor requires integration and cooperation with other site entities.

The current RAC will be transitioning from their ongoing operations to transfer and cooperate with the incoming contractor to allow the incoming contractor to assume full responsibility within the 60 days.

73. Section 5.4 of the Excavation Plan states that debris encountered during excavation will be sorted into three groups, including items that fit into containers. If debris fits into containers, it is our understanding that it can be shipped by rail with the RRM. As such, does it really need to be segregated and managed any differently than the traditional RRM waste?

Response: Debris generated at the Moab site is considered RRM. PWS Section C.2.3.1 states that debris and other building materials shall be sized in accordance with the NRC approved Remedial Action Plan (RAP). However, it should be noted that Attachment L-7, Item 4c, states for cost proposal preparation purposes, the Former Atlas Mill Debris, located within the tailing pile shall be shipped to Crescent Junction via truck.

74. The Emergency Response Plan (Section 4.1.1) states that each site is to maintain a safety kit. No such kits, however, were listed in Attachment J-C (Government Furnished Property). Similarly, various other safety equipment, such as first aid kits, automated external defibrillators, ring buoys near the ponds, etc., were seen during the pre-proposal tour. What, if any, of this equipment will be provided to the RAC as GFSI?

Response: First Aid / Emergency Response equipment currently on the site will be provided as part of the facilities. Attachment J-C will not be modified to list these items.

75. The Emergency Response Plan (Section 5.2) refers to availability of forms on a "shared controlled documents network drive." Is this drive available to all computer users at both sites? Is this drive maintained by the TAC?

Response: Yes to both

76. Is information available that would provide details as to expected weather impact days associated with activities at either the Moab or Crescent Junction site?

Response: No

77. Would DOE please consider allowing bidders to arrange a second site visit?

Response: DOE has offered an opportunity for a second site visit on the Moab acquisition website.

78. In reviewing the RTP and the various site documents, no specific prohibition to the staging of loaded containers of RRM could be found. The only reference that could be found was in Section 2.1.2.2 of the Moab Transportation Security Plan which states that "in the event same day shipment is not practicable, containers are staged in the Moab Site Support Area where security personnel maintain visual observation until the containers are shipped." How many containers can be safely and effectively staged in the Support Area? Can the containers be stacked? Can loaded containers of RRM be staged on railcars at the Moab rail siding over night? What is involved in "maintaining visual observations" of the containers? Can the security guard leave the guard station during off-hours to perform this task, since it does not appear practical to visually observe all of the containers from the guard station?

Response: The Support Area is 400' by 200'. The amount of staging of containers in the Support Area is based on the contractor's technical approach.

No, the containers cannot be stacked.

Yes, railcars with loaded containers are allowed to be staged. Some limiting conditions apply. Refer to Q&A #9 dated 1/13/11.

Security personnel can maintain visual observation of the containers at the support or queue area and the rail siding from the guard station.

79. Attachment L-7 of the RTP states that the contractor is to assume that it will purchase eight Sterling trucks with chassis trailers, and two reach stackers. It appeared from the pre-proposal site tour that there are currently approximately 14 Sterling trucks in use, with approximately nine being used in the contamination area, and five being used in the clean area. Similarly, it appeared that there are currently five reach stackers being used, with two



at the Crescent Junction site, and three at the Moab site (one in the contamination area). What are we to assume relative to the status of these items, in terms of whether the equipment will have been previously used the contamination area or the clean area? Additionally, can DOE provide any information on the assumptions that were used in reducing the levels of equipment for this RTP from the equipment used for the current operations?

Response: Currently, there are eight Sterling trucks and one Linde/Reach Stacker inside the radiological contamination area (CA). Six Kenworth trucks are in the non-radiological area. Additional equipment is currently on-site to support accelerated remediation under ARRA.

80. Section 2.1.2.1 of the Moab Transportation Security references requirements relative to site access as defined in the Moab UMTRA Project Site Security Plan (DOE-EM/GJ1532). This document could not be found in the Moab-RAC reference document list. Please provide a copy of this plan so that we can evaluate the impact of these requirements.

Response: The Transportation Security Plan has been posted on the Moab acquisition website.

81. Attachment J-B identifies applicable regulations including 10 CFR 850, Beryllium Disease Prevention Program. What are the Beryllium levels present in the tailings? Has an assessment been completed and is there a program currently in place at the site? If an assessment has been completed, please provide the reference.

Response: The site has not completed a formal Beryllium Assessment, however, sampling has been conducted for Beryllium and levels above detection limits have not been found. As a result, no Beryllium Program is currently required

82. Reference RTP Sections L.2 and L.5 Table L-1: The solicitation requires the Offeror to submit its electronic proposal through FedConnect to DOE's contract system STRIPES. However, the solicitation does not appear to be posted on FedConnect. Please clarify.

Response: In order to access the solicitation in FedConnect, the contractor must access FedConnect with the same name and DUNS number of the company who received the Master IDIQ Contract award. A FedConnect Tutorial has been posted to the solicitation website at <https://www.fedconnect.net/FedConnect/>. If the contractor still needs help or has additional questions, either email [support@fedconnect.net](mailto:support@fedconnect.net) or call Fed Connect at 1-800-899-6665. The FedConnect Support Center is staffed Monday-Friday 8 a.m. to 8 p.m., EDT, except Federal holidays.

83. Regarding Key Personnel – Is DOE limiting key personnel to the PM and 2 additional personnel or is this the minimum number that are required to be submitted? (Can more than 3 key personnel be submitted?)

Response: Refer to response #26 of Q&A dated 1/13/11.

84. Regarding B.11 Allowability of Subcontractor Fee. "B.11 (b) The fee restriction in paragraph (a) does not apply to members of the contractor's team that are: (1) small businesses." FAR 9.6 does not elaborate on Contractor Team Arrangements with SB primes and Large Business Subcontractors and appears to be written for unrestricted procurement actions where large business form a JV, Partnership or prime/subcontractor Team Arrangements. Given that this is a small business set-aside task and many of the contractor holders are small businesses, are the small businesses prime entities required to share the total available fee of the contract with large business subcontractors?

Response: Yes, the CPAF fee ceiling is inclusive of any fee to be flowed down to the subcontractor.

85. RTP Section L.8(f) provides direction to offerors to prepare a WBS that follows the PWS, in some instances to one level below the PWS. RTP Section H.17 (a)(iv) directs offerors to follow "Work Breakdown Structures, MIL-HDBK-881A." Please confirm that offerors are to follow WBS instructions in RTP Section L.8 (f).

Response: For proposal preparation purposes, the contractor is to follow the WBS instructions in the RTP, Section L.8 (f). Section H.17 will be modified.

86. Please clarify what EVMS documentation is required to be submitted in Volume I, item (6). Section H.2 and H.17 of the basic ID/IQ contract do not require submittals prior to task order award.

Response: The contractor shall submit current and valid EVMS certification documentation with the proposal. In the absence of a certified EVMS, the contractor shall submit an EVMS certification plan to DOE with the proposal.

87. Section L.7(b), Criterion 1 – Technical Approach requires offerors to provide our technical approach only for “major PWS activities” which DOE has defined as “Facility/Ground Maintenance, RRM Excavation and Handling at Moab, Transportation, and disposal cell operations at Crescent Junction, and Project Support.) Please confirm that offerors are not required to provide a written technical approach for PWS activities under C.2.1, Contract Transition, or C.2.4, Demolition of Man-Made Structures, and that the technical approach for these PWS activities will not be included in the proposal evaluation.

Response: RTP Sections L and M will be revised to include C.2.1, Contract Transition, in the evaluation criterion. The contractors are not required to provide a written technical approach for PWS C.2.4, Demolition of Man-Made Structures, nor will it be included in the proposal evaluation.

88. Does the unit cost provided for rock include transportation to the site?

Response: Yes, the unit cost provided for rock includes transportation to the site.

89. The discrepancy between the equipment identified on the purchase list and the Government Furnished Property (GFP) list and what was present during the site tour is substantial. Please provide a list of equipment in use by shift at the Moab site and Crescent Junction site that is in addition to that identified on the purchase list and the GFP list.

Response: Attachment J-C will be revised. The list will not be provided by shift since the contractor can use the GFP as proposed in their technical approach.

90. In the Record of Decision (ROD) for the Remediation of the Moab Uranium Mill Tailings, Grand and San Juan Counties, Utah (70 FR 55358; September 21, 2005), DOE decided to relocate the residual radioactive material (RRM) using predominately rail, with truck transport. Under the 2008 ROD Amendment (73 FR 11103; February 29, 2008), DOE will have the flexibility to use either truck and/or rail for all materials. Please clarify that offerors have the flexibility to use rail or truck transport for the 3,087,500 tons of RRM.

Response: The contractor has the flexibility to use rail or truck shipments for the 3,087,500 M tons of RRM, however, DOE is sensitive to the strong stakeholder desire that the majority of the RRM be transported by rail and the continued utilization of the basic approach and infrastructure. The contractor must propose truck shipments for the 36,000 cy of Former Atlas Mill Debris.

91. Who currently owns the rail cars? What is the lease rate for the cars? If they are not provided by the railroad, does the Government own rail cars that can be used on this project? c. If Energy Solutions currently owns the cars, will they provide a fair price to the bidders to even the playing field?

Response: See Q&A #11 dated 1/13/11.